

Approved

COUNTY OF KAUAI
Minutes of Meeting
OPEN SESSION

Approved as circulated 6/23/18

Board/Commission:	CHARTER REVIEW COMMISSION	Meeting Date	May 21, 2018
Location	Mo'ikeha Building, Meeting Room 2 A/B	Start of Meeting: 3:01 p.m.	End of Meeting: 4:04 p.m.
Present	Chair Carol Suzawa. Vice Chair Jan TenBruggencate. Members: Marissa Sandblom and Ricky Watanabe. Also: Deputy County Attorney Adam Roversi. Boards & Commissions Office Staff: Administrator Nicholas R. Courson and Support Clerk Darcie Agaran.		
Excused	Virginia Kapali, Galen Nakamura, and Patrick Stack		
Absent			

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
Call To Order		Chair Suzawa called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. with four members present which constituted a quorum.
Communications	Chair Suzawa stated that the Commission was in receipt of alternative proposed language with regard to the upcoming ballot questions from Deputy County Attorney Adam Roversi. Mr. Roversi noted that the communication was not a legal opinion.	
Approval of Minutes	<u>Open Session Minutes of April 23, 2018</u> <u>Executive Session Minutes of April 23, 2018</u>	Mr. TenBruggencate moved to approve the Open Session Minutes of April 23, 2018, and the Executive Session Minutes of April 23, 2018, as circulated. Ms. Sandblom seconded the motion. Motion carried 4:0.
Business	<u>CRC 2017-03 Discussion and decision-making on ballot question, purpose, and background for Proposed Charter Amendment to remove Article IX relating to the Public Defender</u> Mr. Roversi stated that his proposed language should be exactly the same as the black language	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>in the Commissioners' meeting packet, adding that his proposed language was preapproved by the Commission at their prior meeting because it was already developed and reviewed by the Commission.</p> <p>Administrator Courson agreed that the first two items (CRC 2017-03 and 2017-04) were previously approved and explained that in developing the latter four items (CRC 2017-05, 2017-08, 2017-13, and 2017-14), there was a difference in the tone of the language, so the reason for the suggested/red language was an attempt to keep the consistency with each item. He noted that it was completely the Commission's discretion on whether or not to accept the suggested/red language.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate asked what the difference was between the black language and the red language to which Administrator Courson replied that the black language was originally approved by the Commission at a prior meeting and the red language was simplified language that's thought to track the latter four items. Mr. TenBruggencate asked if the red language would replace, in its entirety, the ballot question language and the background language to which Administrator Courson replied yes, that would be the purpose if it was adopted.</p> <p>Ms. Sandblom pointed out a difference in the Purpose section from what Mr. Roversi provided and what was provided in the meeting packet; "<i>provide counsel to indigent defendants and when the State</i>" was not in the meeting packet's language. Mr. Roversi stood corrected and agreed that there was a difference. Ms. Sandblom asked if the Commission should substitute the Purpose language in the meeting packet with Mr. Roversi's proposed language to which Mr. Roversi replied that it was a subjective choice for the Commissioners to make. Mr. Roversi explained that the language provided in the meeting packet was the official language that was being presented to the Commission for approval, noting that his proposed language was something to think about.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate felt that there was reference to indigent defendants in the Background section, so it didn't need to be in the Purpose section as well. He clarified that the Commission</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>wasn't hiding the language, but just that it was in a different place. However, Mr. TenBruggencate noted that the red language in the Background section didn't have any mention of indigent defendants, so he wasn't sure how important it was to say that a public defender is for indigent defendants.</p> <p>Ms. Sandblom asked for clarification if the Ballot Question was the only thing that the general voting public would see on the ballot and if the Purpose and Background sections were only on the supplemental educational materials that's printed in the paper ahead of time to which Chair Suzawa replied yes. Mr. Roversi added that the educational materials are printed in the paper and distributed at various sites around the island.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate suggested to adopt the following:</p> <p>Ballot Question: <i>Shall the Charter be amended by repealing Article IX, Public Defender, as this function is already provided by the State?</i></p> <p>Purpose: <i>The Public Defender section of the Kaua'i County Charter was rendered obsolete when the State Constitution in 1968 mandated that the State provide counsel to indigent defendants and when the State Legislature in 1971 established the State Office of the Public Defender. This amendment would therefore remove an outdated and unnecessary article from the Charter.</i></p> <p>Background: <i>In 1971 the State established an Office of the Public Defender and a statewide system for the appointment of legal counsel as required under the law. As such, the County Council has never found it necessary to establish a County Public Defender by ordinance.</i></p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate stated that it would be nice, clean, and simple, which he thought it should</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>be and that they shouldn't make it more difficult than it was.</p> <p>Discussion: Ms. Sandblom asked if there was a rationale for the legalese of Mr. Roversi's proposed language to which he replied that it was the first thing the Commission acted on beginning in 2017, and he was providing a thorough background of the issue. Mr. Roversi stated that he didn't feel one way or the other that the language needed to be included. Ms. Sandblom asked if it was a requirement to which Mr. Roversi replied no.</p> <p>Ms. Sandblom stated that she was uncomfortable with the words "or proper" in the last sentence of the Background section and asked if it could be eliminated. She noted that the mandate was that they weren't supposed to have pros or cons, or sway the voters. Mr. TenBruggencate indicated that he had no objections to the change and Mr. Watanabe agreed.</p> <p>With no further discussion, Chair Suzawa called for the vote on the main motion.</p>	<p>Mr. TenBruggencate moved to adopt the language for CRC 2017-03 as stated. Mr. Watanabe seconded the motion.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate moved to amend the motion to delete the words "or proper" in the Background section. Mr. Watanabe seconded the motion. Motion carried 4:0.</p> <p>Motion carried 4:0.</p>
	<p><u>CRC 2017-04 Discussion and decision-making on ballot question, purpose, and background for Proposed Charter Amendment to remove Article XXX relating to the Electric Power Authority</u></p> <p>Mr. Roversi reiterated that his proposed language was no different than the language in the Commissioners' meeting packet, except for the red language that was provided by the Boards and Commissions Administrator. Administrator Courson also reiterated that the purpose of the</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>red language was to keep it consistent with the latter four items where the subject title followed the roman numerals.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate stated for the record that he had what might appeared to be a conflict; however, since it was simply a clarification issue and his vote was needed to create quorum, he would vote on the item, presuming there would be a motion. Administrator Courson said that Mr. TenBruggencate’s vote would probably be covered by the rule of necessity given their timeline. Mr. Roversi added that if the Commission didn’t act on this item, the language has already been approved, so in essence, the only thing before the Commission was whether to add “Electric Power Authority” or not. Administrator Courson viewed it as a relatively minor housekeeping matter for consistency sake and not a substantive change. Mr. Roversi agreed.</p> <p>Chair Suzawa called for a motion.</p> <p>Mr. Watanabe indicated that he didn’t see a reason to add the red language.</p> <p>Administrator Courson restated that its only purpose was for consistency. For example, for Item CRC 2017-05, “Planning Department” followed “Article XIV”; and for Item CRC 2017-08, “Financial Procedures” followed “Article XIX”. He pointed out that it did say what Article XXX does in the subsequent language, so it was pretty easy to follow with or without the red language. Administrator Courson noted that if it was the Commission’s will to move forward without the red language, then that would be fine.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate said that if that was the Commission’s will, then they could get him out of the predicament by not voting and just letting it proceed, adding that it would avoid creating potential challengeable action. He asked if Mr. Roversi was in agreement to which Mr. Roversi replied yes. Mr. Roversi clarified that the language would stand as printed in black without the</p>	<p>Mr. Watanabe moved to approve the black language without the addition of “Electric Power Authority” for CRC 2017-04.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>addition of the red language.</p> <p>Chair Suzawa stated that the motion failed due to lack of a second and no action was taken.</p>	<p>Motion failed.</p> <p>No action was taken on CRC 2017-04.</p>
	<p><u>CRC 2017-05 Discussion and decision-making on ballot question, purpose, and background for Proposed Charter Amendment to remove the Zoning Board of Appeals (Article XIV, Subsection 14.12 – 14.14.)</u></p> <p>Ms. Sandblom asked, moving forward, if the language was new in the sense that it wasn't approved to which Mr. Roversi replied that that was correct. It was Mr. Roversi's understanding that the language in the Commissioners' meeting packet was developed by a working group subsequent to the Commission's votes at the last meeting, noting that he had no input in that working group. He reiterated that the red language in the Commissioners' meeting packet was Administrator Courson's proposed language. Mr. Roversi explained that after he was presented with all of the information in the Commissioners' meeting packet – both the red and the black language – he proposed alternative language that the Commission could either take or leave. Administrator Courson clarified that the red language was, again, for consistency purposes. He explained that it was noticed that there was a discrepancy with the way the item was listed on the agenda, so the red language was proposed to make it read the same as the others. He noted that it didn't affect the ballot question; rather, it was a heading that doesn't have any particular effect. Other than that, Administrator Courson agreed with Mr. Roversi's assessment.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate suggested to adopt the following:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>3. Proposed Charter Amendment to amend Article XIV, Section 14 by removing the Zoning Board of Appeals</i></p> <p>Ballot Question:</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p><i>Shall Article XIV, Planning Department, Sections 14.01, 14.03, 14.12, 14.13, and 14.14 be amended by removing all references to the Zoning Board of Appeals?</i></p> <p>Purpose: <i>The County has been unable to find volunteers willing to sit on the Zoning Board of Appeals due to the significant time commitment required. Accordingly, this amendment would eliminate the Zoning Board of Appeals.</i></p> <p>Background: <i>The Zoning Board of Appeals was created in the 2016 general election with the expectation that it would reduce or eliminate the expense of hiring hearings officers to conduct appeals from decisions of the Planning Department. However, the Zoning Board of Appeals has proven difficult to enact. It would require seven volunteers to work approximately 16-25 hours weekly and the County has been unable to recruit capable volunteers willing to make such a time commitment. Thus, the Zoning Board of Appeals has never been seated.</i></p> <p>Discussion: Mr. TenBruggencate asked if the language was okay with Administrator Courson to which Administrator Courson replied yes.</p> <p>Ms. Sandblom suggested to include that the Board would require seven volunteers with very specialized skillsets in the Background section. She explained that the Planning Department said not only was it hard to find seven volunteers, but that the volunteers needed to have a certain background. Mr. TenBruggencate stated that the requirements weren't that specialized. His recollection was that it was basically the same requirement as the Planning Commission where they sort of had broad groupings; i.e. labor, business, environmental, etc. Ms. Sandblom</p>	<p>Mr. TenBruggencate moved to adopt the language for CRC 2017-05 as stated. Mr. Watanabe seconded the motion.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	noted that if that was the case, then she was okay with it as is.	Motion carried 4:0.
	<p><u>CRC 2017-08 Discussion and decision-making on ballot question, purpose, and background for Proposed Charter Amendment to amend Article XIX, Financial Procedures, Section 19.15(C) by adding language to include corresponding improvement to those lands or property entitlements</u></p> <p>Ms. Sandblom asked if there were any big distinctions between Mr. Roversi's proposed language and the language that was provided in the Commissioners' meeting packet to which Mr. Roversi replied that he generally made everything longer by attempting to add additional language.</p> <p>Chair Suzawa suggested to remove "be used for" in the Ballot Question and replace it with "include", noting that the Commission wanted to include improvements and not maintenance. She pointed out that Mr. Roversi's proposed language listed the type of improvements. Mr. Roversi explained that the reason he added additional language was because having "improvements" only might leave the voters guessing as to what it meant being that the only thing they will see on the ballot is the question, so he added an extra half sentence to explain that the improvements were for the acquired lands or entitlements, as well as public beach accesses. Mr. TenBruggencate asked if Mr. Roversi's point was that since the voters were only going to see the Ballot Question that they might not recognize that it's more complicated to which Mr. Roversi replied yes.</p> <p>Chair Suzawa stated that she thought the fund was to be used for new public access only and asked if it was for existing public accesses as well to which Mr. Roversi replied that the language the Commission approved at the previous meeting was for all existing public beach accesses. Mr. TenBruggencate agreed.</p> <p>Ms. Sandblom pointed out that she thought the main difference in the language was that the language in the Commissioners' meeting packet mentioned the fund would not be used for</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>regular maintenance, but there was no mention of it in Mr. Roversi’s proposed language; his language was more focused on improvements. She asked if there was a clear distinction as to why it wasn’t mentioned in Mr. Roversi’s proposed language. Administrator Courson stated that it was a feeling out of their working group that they wanted to make it clear to the public that the fund could not be used for regular maintenance. Mr. TenBruggencate noted that the Commission had a discussion about the fact that the County could easily expend all of the money in perpetuity by starting to fund park maintenance. Ms. Sandblom clarified that she wanted to bring it up as it was an important discussion that the Commission had over several meetings. She wasn’t sure if the Commissioners wanted to include that sentence in Mr. Roversi’s proposed language and then adopt it. Mr. Roversi stated that he didn’t put much thought into intentionally excluding that language; however, he felt that the language in the Commissioners’ meeting packet was attempting to explain the Commission’s decision to delete part of the Planning Commission’s proposal as opposed to describing what was actually being presented to the voters.</p> <p>Referring to the meeting minutes of April 23, 2018, Mr. Watanabe noted that the Commission decided to remove the word “maintenance”.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate suggested to adopt the following:</p> <p>Ballot Question: <i>Shall Article XIX, Financial Procedures, Section 19.15(C) be amended to permit the Public Access, Open Space, Natural Resources Preservation Fund to be used for improvements?</i></p> <p>Purpose: <i>Currently the Public Access, Open Space, Natural Resources Preservation Fund may only be used for the acquisition of land or property entitlements for conservation purposes. This amendment would expand the permissible uses of the fund to include paying for improvements to lands or entitlements acquired by the fund, and to</i></p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p><i>improving existing public beach accesses.</i></p> <p>Background: <i>The Public Access, Open Space, Natural Resources Preservation Fund was established by the voters in 2002 to fund the acquisition of land and public easements for land conservation purposes. Conservation purposes include acquisitions for beach and mountain public accesses, the preservation of historic and culturally important areas, the protection of significant habitat or ecosystem, protecting watersheds, conserving land to reduce natural hazards, and improving access to public lands for the disabled. It is the duty of the Open Space Commission to provide an annual recommendation to the County Council regarding lands or entitlements proposed for acquisition. Since the acquisition of land or public easements may require significant expense to improve the acquired land or easement, the Council has in the past refrained from acquiring properties identified by the Open Space Commission due to the expected financial burden of paying for such improvements. This amendment would allow the fund to also be used to improve lands or easements acquired with the fund, and to improve existing public beach accesses, but would not authorize use of the fund proceeds for regular maintenance.</i></p> <p>Chair Suzawa stated that she wanted the ballot question to say, “to include improvements”.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate changed his suggested Ballot Question to state:</p> <p><i>Shall Article XIX, Financial Procedures, Section 19.15(C) be amended to permit the Public Access, Open Space, Natural Resources Preservation Fund to include improvements?</i></p>	<p>Mr. TenBruggencate moved to adopt the language for CRC 2017-08 as stated. Ms. Sandblom seconded the</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Ms. Sandblom asked if that change had an impact on anything to which Mr. Roversi replied that he didn't believe so. Mr. Roversi stated that it was more stylistic than substantive.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate thanked Mr. Roversi for going through the extensive work of reviewing everything and for putting up with the Commission's Frankensteinian actions. Ms. Sandblom thanked Mr. Roversi for being patient.</p> <p>With no further discussion, Chair Suzawa called for the vote.</p>	<p>motion.</p> <p>Motion carried 4:0.</p>
	<p><u>CRC 2017-13 Discussion and decision-making on ballot question, purpose, and background for Proposed Charter Amendment to amend Article XXIX allowing the Salary Commission authority to establish the maximum salaries of all elected and appointed officials</u></p> <p>Mr. Roversi stated that his proposed Ballot Question should be the same as the Ballot Question in the Commissioners' meeting packet, noting that he made changes to the Purpose and the Background sections.</p> <p>Chair Suzawa noted that she liked Mr. Roversi's Purpose and that it was stronger.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate suggested changing the Ballot Question to say "shall be added as" in regards to the Director of Human Resources and the Director of Finance. Chair Suzawa preferred to eliminate the second "shall" and replace it with "add". Mr. TenBruggencate stated that Chair Suzawa's preference implied that the article would be amended to give the Salary Commission the authority to add, which they were not doing.</p> <p>Chair Suzawa said that the "and" made it seem like a two-part ballot question.</p> <p>Ms. Sandblom asked if Chair Suzawa was attempting to restructure the language so that it was just one question to which Mr. TenBruggencate replied that Chair Suzawa wanted to make it</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>really clear that the Director of Human Resources and the Director of Finance would be added as ex-officio members as opposed to just being there.</p> <p>Chair Suzawa stated that she disliked the word “shall”.</p> <p>Ms. Sandblom suggested that the Ballot Question state, “...<i>establish the maximum salaries of all elected and appointed officials, and make the Director of Human Resources and the Director of Finance ex-officio, non-voting members of the Commission?</i>”</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate stated that Chair Suzawa’s proposal was, “...<i>and to add the Director of Human Resources and the Director of Finance as ex-officio, non-voting members of the Commission?</i>” He noted that he was amenable to Chair Suzawa’s proposal.</p> <p>Mr. Watanabe asked if the Commissioners were working off of the language in the meeting packet to which Mr. TenBruggencate replied that they were working off of Mr. Roversi’s proposed language. Ms. Sandblom pointed out that there was a slight difference between the two.</p> <p>Ms. Sandblom was also amenable to Chair Suzawa’s proposal, noting that she had concerns with the word “shall” appearing two times, which made it seem like there were two questions in one.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate suggested to adopt the following:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Ballot Question: <i>Shall Article XXIX, Salary Commission, Sections 29.01 and 20.03 be amended to give the Salary Commission authority to establish the maximum salaries of all elected and appointed officials, and to add the Director of Human Resources and the Director of Finance as ex-officio, non-voting members of the Commission?</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Purpose:</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p><i>This amendment eliminates the County Council’s authority to reject all or part of the Salary Commission’s annual salary resolution thereby giving the Commission sole authority to set the maximum salaries of elected and appointed officials. It also makes the Director of Human Resources and the Director of Finance advisory members of the Salary Commission.</i></p> <p>Background: <i>Under the current charter, the Salary Commission is charged with submitting an annual resolution to the Mayor and Council establishing the maximum salaries of all elected and appointed county officers. The Charter, however, permits the Mayor or relevant department head to set the actual salary of any appointee at a figure lower than the maximum established by the Salary Commission, and authorizes the County Council to reject the Salary Commission’s entire resolution or any part of it. This permits the County Council to pick and choose which appointees in the executive branch of government may receive salary adjustments. This amendment would eliminate the County Council’s veto power over the Salary Commission’s annual resolution, while retaining the right of the Mayor and department heads to set actual salaries at less than the maximum. Any change in County Council salaries would still only take effect in the next Council term. This amendment would also add the Director of Human Resources and the Director of Finance to the existing seven-member Salary Commission as ex-officio, non-voting members to provide information on subject-matter and cost matters.</i></p> <p>Administrator Courson pointed out a typo in the Ballot Question being that Section 20.03 is the Code of Ethics. Mr. Roversi reviewed the Charter and confirmed that Section 20.03 is the Code of Ethics referring to contracts. He stated that both sections should be 29.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate amended his suggestion to replace “20.03” with “29.03”.</p>	<p>Mr. TenBruggencate moved to adopt the language for CRC 2017-13 as stated.</p>

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
		Ms. Sandblom seconded the motion. Motion carried 4:0.
	<p><u>CRC 2017-14 Discussion and decision-making on ballot question, purpose, and background for Proposed Charter Amendment to amend Article VII, Subsection 7.06 giving the Administrator of the Office of Boards and Commissions the authority to appoint or procure a hearings officer for the County of Kaua‘i</u></p> <p>Administrator Courson explained that a concern was brought to his attention regarding the amount of items on any given ballot because the County Council has a few as well. He noted that he has been asked if he thought this proposed amendment was necessary. Administrator Courson stated that he thought it was clarifying; however, he didn’t think it was necessary. As a matter of fact, he’s putting in a Notice for Professional Services this summer for the same purpose, so it would be somewhat weird if the voters voted it down when it was already done. He felt that it was arguable that the proposed amendment would give the Administrator the authority to hire a hearings officer countywide given the way it was currently worded. Administrator Courson clarified that he doesn’t claim that he currently has that authority; however, he felt that he has the authority to hire a hearings officer for the Planning Commission – the same way he can procure snacks, polo shirts, training, per diem, or hotels on O‘ahu. Additionally, he felt he could hire the contractual support that was needed for any one of the boards or commissions in the County. He noted that the budget hasn’t passed yet, but Council had no problem with moving the \$100,000 that’s currently in the Planning Department’s budget to the Office of Boards and Commissions’ budget.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate asked if Ms. Paula Morikami, former Administrator of the Office of Boards and Commissions, wanted to discuss this item. Ms. Morikami stated that she, too, didn’t think it was necessary. Her opinion was that it wasn’t a chartered-type position that needed to be included, noting that the Administrator is able to hire a hearings officer without changing the Charter.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate asked for Mr. Roversi’s thoughts. Mr. Roversi stated that he didn’t</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>disagree with Administrator Courson. He said that the Administrator of the Office of Boards and Commissions has the inherent authority to hire a hearings officer under the existing Charter, so he agreed that having this proposed amendment on the ballot simply clarifies an authority that already exists. Furthermore, Mr. Roversi noted that he wanted to discuss the distinctions between his proposed language and the language that was provided in the Commissioners' meeting packet if the Commission elected to move forward with this item.</p> <p>Ms. Sandblom stated that her understanding was that under the current rules, the Administrator could hire a hearings officer for the Planning Commission. She asked if he was limited to only the Planning Commission to which Administrator Courson replied that he could do it for any of the boards and commissions in the County.</p> <p>Discussion: Mr. TenBruggencate explained that the reason for his motion was because it's a superfluous authority of the Administrator of the Office of Boards and Commissions that didn't require voter approval.</p> <p>With no further discussion, Chair Suzawa called for the vote.</p>	<p>Mr. TenBruggencate moved to not move forward with CRC 2017-14. Mr. Watanabe seconded the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried 4:0.</p>
Announcements	<p>Next Meeting: Next scheduled meeting is June 25, 2018, 3:00 p.m., in the Mo'ikeha Building, Meeting Room 2A/2B</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate asked what the next steps were to which Administrator Courson replied that he didn't think there was much more work for the Commission to do in 2018. Administrator Courson said that the next step was to forward the compiled language to the County Attorney's Office for a final review and then coordinate with the Public Information Officer in July with regard to the voter education materials, which will be brought to the</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Commission for final approval.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate asked if it was Administrator Courson’s understanding that the Commission’s timeline was now in sync with the requirements to include the proposed amendments on the ballot to which Administrator Courson replied that he believed they were slightly ahead of schedule.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate stated that the Commission might not need to meet in June if there was no new information; however, they could start discussing the 2020 election. He recommended that Chair Suzawa review and decide if it was possible to skip the June meeting and meet in July to possibly assess the voter education materials.</p> <p>Mr. Roversi clarified that Rule 4.f. of the Charter Commission Rules is the final step in the approval process and provided that “after all proposals have been finally reviewed, the Commission shall propose the form in which the proposed amendments are submitted to be submitted to the electorate,” which the Commission just completed. Following that, “the Commission shall be responsible for proposing and implementing a public education program to acquaint the electorate with the proposed amendments.” Mr. Roversi stated that past practice was to forward the proposed amendments to the Public Information Office who would develop an education piece, which would then be approved, along with the distribution program, by the Commission at a future meeting. He recalled that the Commission previously had some involvement in approving all of the different distribution locations, as well as how and when it would be published in the newspaper. He noted that if he remembered correctly, former Administrator Furfaro provided a list of the distribution locations to the Commission for their approval. Mr. Roversi explained that the reason he brought that up was because he believed they were past the point of attorney review. He stated that the final form was approved, so the next step would be to send the compiled language to the Public Information Office to create the educational materials.</p> <p>Administrator Courson said that what Mr. Roversi was saying made sense; however, the prior</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>commission clerk's notes provided that there was a final review by the attorney.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate stated that it would be nice if Mr. Roversi could look through the compiled language being that some blending was done. Mr. Roversi said that he would be happy to review it for proof reading and a ministerial review as long as it was understood that there would not be another step where he would provide an attorney opinion for the Commission to make additional changes.</p> <p>Mr. Roversi noted that the Commission rules were vague and so historically they've relied on past practice as a guide for the procedure because the rules don't lay it out exactly. For the Commission's information, he reiterated that he had no problem reviewing the final compilation for form, grammatical errors, etc.; however, there needed to be an understanding that due to the timing, after his final review, it would be forwarded to the Public Information Office to create the educational materials.</p> <p>Administrator Courson asked if it was fair to say that if Mr. Roversi discovered an alarming problem that he would be notified and then he would work with the Chair to call a special meeting to address the problem to which Mr. Roversi replied sure, but he didn't expect to do that. Administrator Courson agreed and noted that that would be his contingency plan and his ask of the Commission.</p> <p>Mr. TenBruggencate explained for the newer commissioners that the public outreach portion in the past included members of the Commission going out and doing some public outreach. He remembered sitting with two members of the Commission in one of the Mayor's Ho'ike programs. Other public outreach activities included speaking about the Charter amendments on radio stations as well as talking through the Charter amendments in a half-hour program at the Ho'ike location.</p> <p>Ms. Sandblom asked if the approval of the public education materials and distribution program were going to be on the agenda for June or July to which Mr. TenBruggencate replied July.</p>	

SUBJECT	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Chair Suzawa stated that she will wait to hear from Staff if a June meeting is necessary, and if not, the Commission can handle everything at the July meeting.</p> <p>Chair Suzawa mentioned that she would like to see the final compilation of the language and asked if that was possible to which Administrator Courson replied yes, definitely. Administrator Courson asked when she would like to see it by to which Chair Suzawa replied as soon as it's completed. Administrator Courson stated that it would be completed quickly enough so that she could determine whether or not to have a June meeting for any necessary corrections. Chair Suzawa said she was comfortable with that.</p> <p>Administrator Courson noted that the meeting minutes must be posted within 30 days, but the Commission could approve it at the following meeting if there was no new business or corrections to be made.</p>	
Adjournment		With no objections, Chair Suzawa adjourned the meeting at 4:04 p.m.

Submitted by: _____
Darcie Agaran, Staff Support Clerk

Reviewed and Approved by: _____
Carol Suzawa, Chair

() Approved as circulated.

() Approved with amendments. See minutes of _____ meeting.